

Name of Committee: Devotion School Building Committee

Meeting Date: 21 March 2014 Time: 9:00 a.m. Meeting Location: Town Hall, Room 103

Attendees: See attached sign-in sheet. Under 940 CMR 29.10(8) Helen Charlupski participated remotely by telephone because of geographic distance from the meeting. Chairwoman DeWitt reviewed the Remote Participation Checklist and confirmed that a quorum is physically present and that all votes would be taken by roll call.

Next Meeting: May 2, 2014 at 8:00 a.m. in Town Hall Room 103

Topic: Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes of the 7 March 2014 Devotion School Building Committee Meeting. Unanimously approved by roll call vote with one (1) abstention (Rowe). Mr. Simmons and Dr. Lupini not present (Lupini arrived later).

Topic: Educational Program

J. Flewelling outlined the process of working with school staff and the architect on the preparation of the written description of the educational program and goals for it as the project progresses. The effort began in the fall of 2013. It describes, among other things, class size and teaching practices; and the intent to make a large school feel and operate like a smaller school. It addresses special education and the integration of students with needs into the general population, the ELL programs (Hebrew and non-Hebrew), world languages, health and wellness, library and media, lunch program, technology, music and the performing arts, physical education, security and supervision of students, enrichment challenge support and other program elements. Working with the architect and school staff, the goal has been to be sure the design options account for the entire educational program.

Dr. Lupini arrived.

Topic: Presentation of Preliminary Design Program (PDP)

G. Metzger presented the five (5) volumes that are the proposed PDP submission to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). If approved at the meeting today, the intent is to submit on 3/24/2014. The MSBA will take up to six (6) weeks to review it. Among the first things they are likely to review are the educational program as defined by the Brookline Public Schools and the narrative describing differences from the MSBA standard. The School Department has provided clear, written documentation to support all aspects of the program. It is expected that the MSBA will have a number of questions and/or will need additional information and that there are likely to be discussions between School/Town staff and MSBA staff in reconciling differences. Finally there will be an approved educational template which will allow the process to continue the development of design schemes that are mutually agreed upon.

The architect confirmed that the four (4) design options approved at the 3.7.2014 Building Committee Meeting all fully accommodate the educational program.

The PDP includes information regarding existing conditions including the recently completed first round of geotechnical investigations, hazardous materials testing and other site work/documentation. It describes development restrictions including preservation issues. It includes conceptual cost estimates and a range of design options that are worthy of further study.

J. Batchelor noted that two meetings of the Preservation Commission were attended by the architect. The first was an informational presentation of the options that were under consideration for the PDP. At the second meeting, the Commission declared the Devotion School to be a “significant” building and imposed a 12-month demolition delay in response to the application for a demolition permit.

Going forward, once the PDP submission is approved, there will be further investigations and the options will be developed to a full feasibility design.

S. Modigliani noted that the cost estimates for the various options are all within a very tight range; \$73-76 million for construction, \$99-103 million total project cost and then add the incremental amount if Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) is adopted. He is of the opinion that costs for phasing, transportation need to be further developed and tested against the options. G. Metzger agreed noting the costs as included in the PDP are limited to those that concern the MSBA.

In response to a question, it was noted that any discussions between the MSBA and the Town of Brookline (TOB) around the PDP submission are expected to happen on a staff level. If it appears there are bigger issues that may not be resolvable on that level, the Building Committee may need to assist.

In response to a question, Chairwoman DeWitt stated that the design criteria that will be discussed at the next meeting will include community and neighborhood impacts.

***Motion to approve the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) and to authorize the Owner's Project Manager to submit it to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA).***

***Unanimously approved by roll call vote. (Mr. Simmons not present)***

Topic: CMR Application to the Inspector General's Office (IG)

T. Guigli stated that the Building Commission has voted to authorize the Town Administrator (TA) to submit an application to the Inspector General for approval to use the CMR delivery method for this project.

A discussion of the merits of CMR then ensued. It was noted that the CMR delivery method is best suited for complex projects with sensitive schedule demands, phasing, work in occupied buildings or other complicating factors. The Devotion School project meets these criteria.

CMR projects usually have higher costs initially, but may yield better results in the form of fewer unforeseen conditions, greater engagement with the contractor and involvement of the contractor during design. This may result in fewer delays, change orders and claims.

G. Metzger stated that HMFH recommends the TOB consider CMR for this project. In their experience, that delivery method works best for a project like this. In addition to the reasons above, a CM has greater control over subcontractors, helping ensure that they understand their scope of work and "buy-in" of the construction schedule. HMFH most recent experience was Wayland High School. It was completed on time with three (3) early bid packages and the final cost was about 4% less than expected. The total construction cost was about \$55 million. In response to a question, he stated he did not know what the premium for CMR was on that project (over Low Bid) but he estimated it at about 5-6%.

He also noted that the Awarding Authority is not committed to the CMR until the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) is agreed to. If no agreement, the Awarding Authority may revert to the Design Bid Build methodology.

In response to a question, it was noted the earliest the TOB could get a CMR company on board would be late summer or early fall. It is a qualifications based selection process. There are different ways to compensate the CMR; all of which would be addressed in the contract with them.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Guigli  
Owner's Project Manager